REMARKS·

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Claims 1, 2, 19, 31, 38, and 39 are currently being amended.

Claims 50-53 are currently being added. No new matter has been added.

This amendment adds, changes and/or deletes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-25 and 27-53 are now pending in this application.

1.   Rejection of Claims 1-5, 7-9, 11-13, 15, 16, 18-21, 23, 24, 27, 28, 30-36, 38-41, 43, 44, and 46-48 as Being Anticipated by Stewart et al.

In section 7 of the Office Action, claims 1-5, 7-9, 11-13, 15, 16, 18-21, 23, 24, 27, 28, 30-36, 38-41, 43, 44, and 46-48 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Stewart et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,970,927). Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection in view of the foregoing amendments and the reasons that follow.

Claim 1 is in independent form and has been amended to recite a combination including, among other elements, "selecting a single level of security from a group of more than two security levels . . . wherein the group of more than two security levels is defined by a user of the network user node," which is not disclosed by Stewart et al. Specifically, Stewart et al. does not disclose security levels "defined by a user of the network user node." Stewart et al. is directed to a communication system for providing access level features on a distributed network system. Col. 1, lines 60-63. Stewart et al. discloses that a personal computing device (PCD) "may store identification information which may indicate an access level for that PCD," col. 2, lines 17-18, and that the access level may be "specified by the

terms of the [user's network provider] subscription," col. 15, lines 13-14, but Stewart et al. does not disclose "selecting a single level of security from a group of more than two security levels . . . wherein the group of more than two security levels is defined by a user of the network user node," (emphasis added) as recited by independent claim 1, as amended. Therefore, because Stewart et al. fails to disclose at least one limitation of independent claim 1, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of independent claim 1, and corresponding dependent claims 2-5, 7-9, 11-13, 15, and 16, be withdrawn.

Claim 18 is in independent form and recites a combination including, among other elements, "a storage device for storing a table of security modifications . . . , the security modifications being defined by a user of the network user node," which is not disclosed by Stewart et al. Applicants point out that pages 3-4 of the Office Action do not specifically address this limitation, and Applicants have found no portions of Stewart et al. that disclose this limitation. As discussed with respect to independent claim 1, Stewart et al. does not disclose security levels "defined by a user of the network user node." Stewart et al. is directed to a communication system for providing access level features on a distributed network system. Col. 1, lines 60-63. Stewart et al. discloses that a personal computing device (PCD) "may store identification information which may indicate an access level for that PCD," col. 2, lines 17-18, and that the access level may be "specified by the terms of the [user's network provider] subscription," col. 15, lines 13-14, but Stewart et al. does not disclose "a storage device for storing a table of security modifications . . . , the security modifications being defined by a user of the network user node," as recited in independent claim 18. Therefore, because Stewart et al. fails to disclose at least one limitation of independent claim 18, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of independent claim 18, and corresponding dependent claims 20, 21, 23, 24, 27, and 28, be withdrawn.

Claim 30 is in independent form and recites a combination including, among other elements, "using a network user node to modify security protection for data to a single level from a group of more than two levels," which is not disclosed by Stewart et al. In support of the rejection of claim 30, the Examiner refers to FIG. 5, which shows a data structure for storing identification information, network provider information, and access information. Col. 13, lines 5-10. The system disclosed in Stewart et al. uses an access point (AP) to "use

the identification information to . . . determine the appropriate network provider and the respective access method and/or access level." The system disclosed in Stewart et al. does not use a "network user node to modify security protection for data to a single level from a group of more than two levels," as recited in independent claim 30.

The Examiner further refers to Stewart et al. at col. 19, line 60 through col. 20, line 10. Applicants submit that the cited portion of Stewart et al. reinforces the Applicants position with respect to claim 30, in reciting "determining an access level for the portable computing device after receiving the identification information [at a first access point from the portable computing device]." As discussed above, this and other portions of Stewart et al. disclose that the system in Stewart uses the access points to determine an "access level." Stewart et al. does not disclose "using a network user node to modify security protection for data to a single level from a group of more than two levels," as recited in claim 30. Therefore, because Stewart et al. does not disclose at least one limitation of independent claim 30, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of independent claim 30, and corresponding dependent claims 31-36, be withdrawn.

Claim 38 is in independent form and has been amended to recite a combination including, among other elements, "a network user node . . . wherein the network user node performs security modifications based on the physical location of the network user node," which is not disclosed by Stewart et al. As discussed with respect to independent claim 30, the system disclosed in Stewart et al. uses an access point (AP) to "use the identification information to . . . determine the appropriate network provider and the respective access method and/or access level." Stewart et al. does not disclose a system "wherein [a] network user node performs security modifications based on the physical location of the device," as recited in independent claim 38. Therefore, because Stewart et al. does not disclose at least one limitation of independent claim 38, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of independent claim 38, and corresponding dependent claims 39-41, 43, 44, and 46-48, be withdrawn.

Application Serial No. 10/053,013

2.   Rejection of Claims 6, 10, 14, 22, 25, 37, 42, and 45 as Being Unpatentable Over Stewart et al. in View of Bade et al.

In section 8 of the Office Action, claims 6, 10, 14, 22, 25, 37, 42, and 45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stewart et al. in view of Bade et al. (U.S. Patent Appl. Publ. No. 2002/0138632). Claims 6, 10, and 14 depend from claim 1. Claims 22 and 25 depend from claim 18. Claim 37 depends from claim 30. Claims 42 and 45 depend from claim 38. As discussed above, independent claims 1, 18, 30 and 38 are believed to be patentable over Stewart et al. Bade et al. does not make up for the deficiencies of Stewart et al. with respect to independent claims 1, 18, 30, and 38. Accordingly, Applicants submit that independent claims 1, 18, 30, and 38, and corresponding dependent claims 6, 10, 14, 22, 25, 37, 42, and 45, are patentable over Stewart et al. in view of Bade et al., and respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

3.   Rejection of Claims 17, 29, and 49 as Being Unpatentable Over Stewart et al. in View of Zillikens et al.

In section 9 of the Office Action, claims 17, 29, and 49 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stewart et al. in view of Zillikens et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,813,503). Claim 17 depends from claim 1. Claim 29 depends from claim 18. Claim 49 depends from claim 38. As discussed above, claims 1, 18, and 38 are believed to be patentable over Stewart et al. Zillikens et al. does not make up for the deficiencies of Stewart et al. with respect to independent claims 1, 18, and 38. Accordingly, Applicants submit that independent claims 1, 18, and 38, and corresponding dependent claims 17, 29, and 49, are patentable over Stewart et al. in view of Zillikens et al., and respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

4.   New Claims 50-53

New claims 50-53 have been added. New claim 50 depends from independent claim 1. New claim 51 depends from independent claim 18. New claim 52 depends from independent claim 30. New claim 53 depends from independent claim 38. Independent claims 1, 18, 30, and 38 are believed to be patentable over the cited references. New claims

-12-

50-53, being dependent upon independent claims 1, 18, 30, and 38, are believed to be patentable over the cited references for at least the same reasons.

Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 06-1447. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check or credit card payment form being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 06-1447. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petition for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorize payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 06-1447.

Respectfully submitted,

Date ___6/23/2006___   By _____

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP .   Matthew J. Swietlik
Customer Number: 26371   Attorney for Applicants
Telephone: (414) 319-7306   Registration No. 58,428
Facsimile: (414) 297-4900

-13-